

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

| APPLICATION NO.                            | FILING DATE      | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/354,945                                 | 07/15/1999       | AKIO KOSAKA          | 09952/029001        | 5787             |
| 27572                                      | 7590 11/03/2004  | EXAMINER             |                     | INER             |
| ,  | DICKEY & PIERCE, | CRAVER, CHARLES R    |                     |                  |
| P.O. BOX 828<br>BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303 |                  |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |                  |                      | . 2682              |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/354,945   | KOSAKA, AKIO   |  |  |  |
| raviosity reason   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  | Charles R Craver   | 2682   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 01 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | oid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which  | tion. A proper reply to a  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date  | <u>-</u>   |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context of | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply contained the mail of the mail of the mail of the shortened statutory period for reply contained the mail of the mail of the safet than three months after the mail of the safet than three months after the mail of the safet than three months after the mail of the safet than three months after the mail of the safet than three months after the safet three safet than three safet three sa | R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further   | er consideration and/or search (s  | ee NOTE below);  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b   | elow);   |  |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or  | n better form for appeal by mater  | rially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:   | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claims.   |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti  | ion(s):  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a se  | parate, timely filed amendment   |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: see   | reconsideration has been consideration.  | dered but does NOT place the   |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY to  | o issues which were newly  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment (explanation of how the new or amended claims wo   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> .   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr  | oved or b) disapproved by th   | ne Examiner.   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen   | t(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).   | _  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   | ,  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 09/354,945

Art Unit: 2682

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9-1-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the combination of Ohno into the invention of Nakaya, the invention of Nakaya discloses the necessary limitation of observing battery status to change coding and other features. Ohno is combined with Nakaya not to disclose such a limitation, as such is already taught by Nakaya; Ohno is combined with Nakaya by the examiner to show that the deficiencies of Nakaya, namely, controlling speed as well as coding.

Ohno discloses that power may be saved by lowering a communication speed via coding in order to prolong battery life. Nakaya discloses that battery saving is useful as well. As such, Ohno established that lowering transmission speed as well as coding speed would have been an improvement over Nakaya, and as such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Note that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Art Unit: 2682

### Conclusion

## Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

### Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 for both formal and informal/draft communications, labeled as such.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Plaza II, 200 South 20<sup>th</sup> St, Lobby, Room 1B03, Arlington VA.

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Charles Craver at (703) 305-3965.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin, can be reached at (703) 308-6739.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-4700.

CC

C.Craver

CHARLES CRAVER PRIMARY EXAMINER

October 28, 2004